

NEW PROPOSALS

JOURNAL OF MARXISM AND INTERDISCIPLINARY INQUIRY



VOLUME TEN, NUMBER 2, NOVEMBER 2019

New Proposals: Journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry
Volume 10, Number 2, November 2019
ISSN 1715-6718

© New Proposals Editorial Collective

Our Mandate

This journal represents an attempt to explore issues, ideas, and problems that lie at the intersection between the academic disciplines of social science and the body of thought and political practice that has constituted Marxism over the last 150 years. New Proposals is a journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry that is dedicated to the radical transformation of the contemporary world order. We see our role as providing a platform for research, commentary, and debate of the highest scholarly quality that contributes to the struggle to create a more just and humane world, in which the systematic and continuous exploitation, oppression, and fratricidal struggles that characterize the contemporary sociopolitical order no longer exist.

Volume 10:2 Issue Editor

Charles R. Menzies

Editorial Collective

Charles R. Menzies, Sharon R. Roseman, Steve Striffler

Design and Layout

Kenneth Campbell

International Advisory Panel

Avram Bornstein, Karen Brodtkin, August Carbonella, A. Kim Clark, Kate Crehan, John Gledhill, Linda Green, Sharryn Kasmir, Ann Kingsolver, Richard B. Lee, Winnie Lem, David McNally, Susana Narotzky, Bryan Palmer, Thomas C. Patterson, R. S. Ratner, Gerald M. Sider, Alan Smart, Gavin A. Smith

Contact Us

New Proposals online at <http://www.newproposals.ca>

New Proposals Blog and Discussion at <http://newproposals.blogspot.com>

Email info@newproposals.ca

Cover: Reflections, East Shore of Porcher Island, Gitxaala Territory. Charles R. Menzies photograph.

New Proposals

Journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry

Volume 10, Number 2, November 2019. ISSN 1715-6718

Contents

Introduction

Celebrating Ten Volumes 5

Article

From Colonialism to Neocolonialism: Indigenous Learners and
Saskatchewan's Education Debts 6
Paul Orlowski, Michael Cottrell

Interview

Manufacturing Consent: A Concern That Lasted 40 Years.
Interview with Michael Burawoy 17
Paula Varela

Argument

Foundations of Post-capitalist Society in Marx's Capital 25
Ali Javaherian

Introduction

Charles R. Menzies

New Proposals Editorial Collective

Celebrating Ten Volumes

This issue marks the completion of ten volumes of *New Proposals*. It's an accomplishment that I didn't envision when more than a decade ago my friends and colleagues Kate McCaffrey, Anthony Marcus, and I toyed with the idea of a setting up a Marxist academic journal. We met as students in the anthropology doctoral program at the City University of New York in the early 1990s. We shared a similar history of left activism that contributed to our antipathy toward then fashionable post-modernism. When we both found ourselves in the academy we wondered about the absence of a place for unashamed radical scholarship – and this journal was born.

We've covered a lot of ground since our first issue in 2007 – timed for release to commemorate International Workers Day. David Hakken's (2007) long paper on the political economy of knowledge in cyberspace was coupled with our own call for "class struggle anthropology" (Menzies and Marcus 2007). June Nash wrote in 2008 about the way in which 'development' led to genocide in one country and ethnocide in another. Development is, as Nash documented, no innocent technocratic process; it's clearly about expropriation and expansion of capitalism.

We've had special issues, such as that guest edited by Scott Simon on capitalism and Indigenous peoples (2011, Vol. 5:1). In 2010 we featured *Indigenous Nation and Marxism* (Vol. 3:3). Both issues highlighted perspectives that simultaneously respected the cultural particularities of Indigenous societies without denying the material realities of actually existing Indigenous societies in which interconnection with capitalist relations of production are fact.

One recent issue features student autoethnographies (2018, Vol. 9:2). One aspect of being an anthropologist involves prying into other peoples' lives. If we are unwilling to probe ourselves with a similar degree of intensity, what right do we have to ask other people to share? This group of students accepted the challenge and their work shows the power of turning the anthropological gaze back onto itself.

This current issue continues our approach to a varied multidisciplinary progressive scholarship. Here we cover the gamut: Indigenous education and colonialism – radical sociology – post-capitalist futures. There is a delight bringing forward scholarship that might otherwise never see the light of day!

From Colonialism to Neocolonialism: Indigenous Learners and Saskatchewan's Education Debt

Paul Orlowski, Michael Cottrell
University of Saskatchewan

ABSTRACT: Despite prevailing myths of social harmony and cooperation Saskatchewan is a jurisdiction with a race problem rooted in a problematic colonial history. By highlighting the persistent racialization of educational opportunities and inequalities in Saskatchewan, we document the systematic assaults on Indigenous epistemologies, languages, and cultures that occurred within schools and implicate these schools in the production and reproduction of deeply embedded intergenerational educational disadvantage. The article makes the case that the colonial model employed by European settlers to marginalize the original inhabitants of the land evolved into a neocolonial model that continues the marginalization of Indigenous peoples in present-day Saskatchewan. In arguing that schools have failed Indigenous students rather than vice versa, we reframe current Indigenous educational disparities as an *educational debt* rather than an *achievement gap* and document the multiple ways in which that *educational debt* continues to socially and economically exclude Indigenous peoples, especially through the racialization of poverty. We conclude that only substantial compensatory educational funding, as part of a wider program of redistribution and poverty reduction, can address the *educational debt* and ensure equitable educational outcomes for Indigenous learners in Saskatchewan.

KEYWORDS: Saskatchewan, Indigenous education, educational debt, colonialism, neocolonialism, compensatory funding.

Despite the prevailing myths of “social harmony and a tradition of cooperation” (Green 2006, 525), Saskatchewan is a jurisdiction with a race problem rooted in a problematic colonial history. The legacy of colonialism’s hostility to the land’s original inhabitants¹ is deeply embedded in Saskatchewan’s institutions, including its schools.² Thus, Saskatchewan is no dif-

ferent from other jurisdictions where Euro-settlers³ took control of the lands across Canada. There was a brutality specific to this bi-racial interaction on the prairies, however (Daschuk 2013).

This paper makes a case that there is an educational debt owed to Indigenous peoples in Saskatchewan. It begins with an historical perspective beginning in the 1870s with the signing of the Prairie Treaties and the imposition of the Indian Act. This is followed by a brief discussion of various strategies employed by contemporary Indigenous youth involving the attainment or rejection of social and economic capital in the contexts of the school and the community. The main objective of this paper is to make a case for increased funding in order to improve the educational outcomes and life chances of Indigenous learners in Saskatchewan. The paper concludes with an outline of a plan for this targeted funding.

1 Throughout this article, several terms are used to represent the original inhabitants of North America. Indian is used only when it refers to historical documents such as the Indian Act. First Nations is the preferred term in Canada, and this term is used instead of Indian in most cases. Aboriginal is used in Canadian constitutional law and in government-sponsored documents such as the Truth and Reconciliation Report (2015), and includes First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples. Indigenous is also an accepted term, and appears to be preferred in many circles today. The term is used whenever applicable. In some instances, either Aboriginal or Indigenous could have been used.

2 Section 93 of the Canadian constitution assigned jurisdiction over education to the provinces, resulting in the establishment of secular and denominational publicly funded systems regulated by provincial Ministries of Education in most provinces, including Saskatchewan. However, the federal government retained jurisdiction over “Indians, and Lands reserved for the Indians” (Carr-Stewart 2003). Thus the Indian Act, administered by the federal Department of Indian Affairs (DIA), subsequently became the all-encompassing mechanism for fulfilling Canada’s obligations in all matters, including education, to First Nations people (Carr-Stewart 2003). Residential schools in Saskatchewan were administered by the Federal government until the 1990s, at which point Indigenous students either attended provincial schools or First Nation-controlled schools on reserves.

3 Throughout this article, the preferred term used to signify the peoples that usurped the land of Indigenous peoples is Euro-settlers. This is in keeping with the burgeoning scholarship on settler colonialism in Canada, the USA, Australia, and New Zealand. Settler colonialism is a distinct type of colonialism that functions through the replacement of Indigenous populations with an invasive settler society that, over time, develops a distinctive identity and sovereignty.

Achievement Gap and Educational Debt

The term *achievement gap* has often been used by educational researchers to explain disparities in academics between students from various minorities compared to White students. In particular the term is most often used to highlight differences in high school graduation rates and especially in standardized test scores. Ladson-Billings contends that a focus on the achievement gap places the onus where it should not be because it implies a cultural deficit on the part of oppressed groups rather than an institutional deficit that further privileges dominant groups (Ladson-Billings 2006).

The term *education debt* more accurately reflects the contemporary situation and points to factors that have accumulated over time. According to Ladson-Billings, the education debt “comprises historical, economic, sociopolitical, and moral components” that illuminate the execution of systemic and institutional power (2006, 3). In this paper, we use both terms by arguing that these historical, economic, sociopolitical, and moral components accurately explain why there has been a persistent achievement gap, thereby demonstrating the existence of an education debt in the province of Saskatchewan. While emphasizing the critical role of publicly funded education as a potential means of mitigating disadvantage and promoting social cohesion, we draw on insights from post-colonial and neo-Marxist theory to argue that schools, alone, cannot effect the larger social and structural changes required to eliminate the racialization of poverty in the province of Saskatchewan. Regardless of the effectiveness of public schools thus far, there is an education debt owed to Indigenous peoples living in the province.

Colonialism and Saskatchewan’s Education Debt

A strong case can be made that there is an *educational debt* to Indigenous peoples in Saskatchewan resulting from well over a century of colonization. The educational debt warrants compensatory funding in support of present and future Indigenous learners in the K-12 school system. Indeed, in a major study with First Nations and Métis students and parents involving fifteen research sites across Saskatchewan, “participants spoke eloquently of the historical education debt and its continued malign implications for Aboriginal

peoples” in the province (Pelletier, Cottrell and Hardie 2013, vii). For Saskatchewan’s Indigenous peoples, the importance of this education debt cannot be overstated.

Schooling for Indigenous youth has come a long way from the residential school policy that was institutionalized in Canada in the 1870s until the last school closed over a century later (Cottrell 2010; Barman 1995). Although the high school graduation rates for Indigenous youth have shown slight improvement in recent years, in Saskatchewan there is still a massive gap: in 2017, the graduation rate for non-Indigenous students was 76.5 percent compared to 43.2 percent for their Indigenous peers (Government of Saskatchewan 2017). Although some may utilize cultural deficit discourses to explain this discrepancy, *colonialism* is the fundamental explanation for inequitable outcomes.

Colonialism, typically, is legitimated by myths of superiority, inevitability, and racism, and is enforced by the colonizers’ socio-political institutions. Canadian colonialism was justified by the *essentialist* racial discourse that framed Indigenous peoples as alien “others” to emerging provincial and national identities based on Christianity, Anglo-Saxon cultural norms, and capitalist ideals of progress and wealth acquisition (Frankenberg 1993). It was assumed that this biological superiority conferred an attendant right to dictate the fate of all other races. Thus, a model of colonization was developed and implemented to gain control over Indigenous peoples and their lands, a model that began with the English colonization of Ireland in the 16th century (Wood 2003). Indeed, contagious disease and intentional starvation were early strategies used by the Canadian state to maintain power over the First Nations (Daschuk 2013).

In Saskatchewan Colonialism Began in the 1870s

Since the Canadian federal government followed British precedent in utilizing treaties as instruments of nation-building, formal agreements that guaranteed reserve lands and other rights, including education, were negotiated with Indigenous groups in what became Saskatchewan in the 1870s (Carr-Stewart 2003). Treaties 4 and 6 are the major treaties covering Saskatchewan that were signed by First Nations leaders and the federal government in the 1870s. These num-

bered treaties constituted the benign face of Canadian colonialism and arguably also represented attempts on the part of prairie First Nations to achieve an accommodation with Euro-Canadian society by accessing formal schooling and other technologies of modernity. Much more malign were subsequent federal policies of dispossession, removal, and transformation through which Indigenous autonomy was coercively appropriated (Daschuk 2013; Dickason and McNab 2008; Green 2006). The facts bore this out.

In order to bring the prairie lands into the geography and body politic of the newly formed country called Canada in the 1870s, the federal government desired European immigrants to farm the land. The land belonged to the prairie First Nations, of course, many of whom were migratory hunters of the buffalo. To force the First Nations to cede the lands to the federal government, massive numbers of bison were slaughtered by White bison hunters in the 1800s (Daschuk 2013; Dickason and McNab 2008; Tobias 1983). This was a necessary condition in order to help persuade European farmers to immigrate to the plains. To that end, Prime Minister MacDonald sent Alexander Morris, the main Treaty Commissioner of the federal government, to negotiate on behalf of Canada with the First Nations leaders (Tobias 1983). After long negotiations, treaties were agreed upon and signed. The treaty details are clear (Talbot 2009).

The European settlers would receive parcels of land as the First Nations people were to be moved to tiny reserves, based on a general formula of 128 acres per person (Miller 2009). The spirit of intent pertaining to this dispossession of Indigenous lands was only to be to the depth of a plough. (This point will be discussed in a subsequent section about the education debt.) The newcomers would be able to live in peace because the First Nations agreed to this. They would also be able to practice their various European-based religions. In exchange for these promises, the First Nations people would receive education in day schools located on or next to the new reserves – the Cree, Saulteaux, Dene and Dakota leaders wanted the next generation to know how to read and write in order to better understand the ways of the Euro-Canadians. They were to receive medical help, and agricultural tools to change from hunters to farmers. Clearly, *all* of the people living

on the prairies in those days were treaty people, regardless of race (Miller 2009).

Acknowledging the brutal strategies of state-sponsored coercion, the First Nations people honoured the promises they made in the treaties (Dickason and McNab 2008). They were soon to find out, however, that honouring one's word did not go both ways. For example, whenever the First Nations people became successful at farming and out-competed the settlers, as occurred in the Qu'Appelle Valley, they were quickly relocated to less arable land (Carter 1993; Daschuk 2013). There were far more duplicitous actions by the federal government that the First Nations would experience, however, actions with extremely disastrous consequences.

Even worse, at the same time that Morris and the leaders of the prairie First Nations were engaged in treaty negotiations, the federal government was developing another legal document in Ottawa, one that had *absolutely no input from First Nations people*. Once it became law it changed the lives of every Indigenous person in Canada from the 1870s until today. It was called *the Indian Act*.

The Indian Act Renders Prairie Treaty Promises About Education Meaningless

The Indian Act of 1876, a clear example of how the essentialist discourse led to racist government policy, defined Indigenous peoples as wards of the state, and empowered the federal government to enforce aggressive assimilation policies as a means of rendering Indigenous people into acculturated Canadian citizens (St. Denis 2007). A mass system of segregated education was seen as critical to the achievement of this goal and was formalized through the Indian Act and the infamous Davin Report of 1879⁴ (Milloy 1999). Education as a tool in the cultural transformation of Indigenous peoples found particularly graphic expression in residential schools, which operated between the 1880s and the 1990s as partnerships between the Canadian state and various Christian churches

⁴ Based on his observations of schools in the US, Davin recommended that the Canadian Federal government, in partnership with Christian churches, should operate residential or industrial schools, where Indigenous children would be removed from their families and subjected to a regime of radical resocialization to assimilate them into Euro-Canadian culture. See Davin 1879.

(Cappon 2008). Indigenous children were forcibly removed from their homes at the age of six to residential schools where, if they survived, they would remain until 16. Parents were not allowed to visit their children in these schools that were located extremely far from the reserves. Children could only see their parents during the summer months. *Thousands* of them died either in the schools or trying to escape from them to find their way home. Tragically, some parents never found out what happened to their children (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015).

The residential school system for First Nations children was created with the stated intention of assimilating them into mainstream Canadian society. This system was flawed right from its outset, however, as the design of the policy itself appears to have been “not for assimilation but for inequality” (Barman 1995, 57). A lack of understanding of First Nations cultures in the curriculum, inadequate funding leading to poor food and undernourished students, inferior instruction from mostly poorly qualified teachers, and only half days for academics immediately doomed this educational project to failure. Whether intentional or not, the state’s policy on Indigenous education “made possible no other goal than Aboriginal peoples’ absolute marginalization from Canadian life – a goal schools achieved with remarkable success” (Barman 1995, 75). The underpinnings for this project were based on the essentialist discourse of White supremacy. The Canadian government wanted First Nations people to assimilate into the bottom rungs of mainstream society, as farm workers and domestic servants, because they were fearful of violent conflict and “Indian wars,” such as was occurring in the United States (Miller 2009; Milloy 1999). The schools embarked on a philosophy of “kill the Indian to save the man,” (Friedel 2010, 4) resulting in cultural genocide. First Nations parents’ worst fears about what these schools were doing to their children were being realized – they were being physically beaten for myriad reasons, even for speaking the language they spoke at home with their parents. The mandate to rid First Nations languages and traditions led to a culture of severe violence within the schools in which the children had no one to protect them – parents were most often forbidden to visit their own children.

First Nations leaders demanded that the federal government adhere to what was promised in the signed treaties. In particular, they wanted day schools to be on or near the reserves as was agreed upon in the treaties. The cold and cruel response was that the Indian Act negated anything the government had promised in the signed treaties. In other words, the Treaty 4 and 6 promises made by the federal government through its representative Alexander Morris were virtually meaningless. The anguish experienced by Indigenous parents and children as a result of this egregious and duplicitous policy of institutional racism is incomprehensible to most White people (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015). The facts about kidnapping young innocent Indigenous children and forcing them to grow up under the horrific conditions of residential schools are evidence that paying an historical education debt is warranted.⁵

As a contemporary example of the lingering ignorance among many White people, consider an editorial published in August 2017 in a Saskatchewan newspaper. The author lamented that First Nations leaders often speak of the racism they experience (cited by Hunter 2017). Called “When will it end?,” the editorial claimed that “racism is a daily reality . . . for everyone,” yet First Nations people are the only ones “claiming racism.” The incorrect implication was that even though White people also experience racism, they do not complain about it. This position refuses to acknowledge White privilege in all of the nation’s institutions. Even worse, a Conservative Senator, Lynn Beyak, was embroiled in a battle with her senate colleagues over racist letters she had posted on her parliamentary website, refusing to remove them. Beyak “is the Indian residential school apologist who believes the schools weren’t all that bad and that the Truth and Reconciliation Commission – which found that at least 6,000 children died in the schools – could have done a better job focusing on the positives” (Talaga 2019).

Canadian authorities have acknowledged that residential schools were responsible for brutalizing children emotionally, psychologically, physically, spiritually, culturally, and sexually (Milloy 1999). The narratives

⁵ The use of the term *kidnapping* may be jarring to some readers. We use it because it is an accurate portrayal of what transpired when government officials appeared at the homes of Indigenous families to apprehend children against the will of the parents.

of survivors of the residential school system included in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report make explicit the pain and suffering of Indigenous peoples at the hands of a racist federal government steeped in the belief that colonization of the First Nations people was for the best: “‘savages’ were to emerge as Christian ‘white men’” (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015, 58). The findings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada provide evidence of the European assumption that they were a superior race of people:

The educational goals of the schools were limited and confused, and usually reflected a low regard for the intellectual capabilities of Aboriginal people. For the students, education and technical training too often gave way to the drudgery of doing the chores necessary to make the schools self-sustaining. Child neglect was institutionalized, and the lack of supervision created situations where students were prey to sexual and physical abusers. [Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015, 3-4]

It has become clear that it was not a civilized people educating savages as the government claimed and the media of the day portrayed; rather, the narratives of residential school survivors strongly suggest that the opposite was closer to the truth (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015).

The government’s insistence on separating children from their families over multiple generations resulted in a significant incapacitation of the cohesiveness and social sustainability of First Nations families and communities. This created a “complex situation where a high level of *dependency* toward the state is combined with a *profound distrust* of that same state” among most Indigenous peoples (Papillon and Cosentino 2004, 1). In other words, the legacy of the racist residential school policy very much exists today. The social problems and low economic status of large segments of Indigenous peoples today are evidence of that. Indeed, postcolonial historiography locates in these institutions the roots of many contemporary educational challenges in Saskatchewan, especially the enduring disconnect between Indigenous peoples and state-sponsored formal educational institutions (Battiste 2005; Cottrell, Preston and Pearce, 2012).

Many Canadians are unaware that the federal government has not lived up to the promises negotiated in the numbered treaties of the prairies (Tupper 2012). They do not understand that the First Nations leaders negotiated with the federal government a promise of schools to be located on or near the newly created reserves rather than the residential schools. Nor is the fact well known that the First Nations *have* lived up to all of the promises they made in Treaties 4 and 6, or that the federal government implemented the Indian Act and residential school policy immediately after the Treaties were signed. There are other factors in the contemporary context, however, that further highlight an education debt owed to Indigenous peoples in Saskatchewan. These factors demonstrate the evolution of the colonization model into a scenario best described as neo-colonialism.

Strategies Utilized by Indigenous Youth to Survive the Neo-Colonial Experience Today

Do Indigenous high school students in Saskatchewan have to act White to improve their academic standing? If they do, are they then subjected to ridicule and viewed as “sellouts” by their communities if they succeed? These are the questions posed by several scholars in a seminal work edited by Ogbu entitled *Minority Status, Oppositional Culture, and Schooling* (2008). Although the focus of the book is on African American adolescents, some of the contributions are useful when applied to the situations experienced by Indigenous youth in Saskatchewan.

One of the objectives throughout Ogbu’s work was to theorize the *roots of oppositional culture* in minority youth groups. He proposed that the expectations of the dominant White culture about how the Other was to behave led to minorities bearing the “burden” of acting White, especially in schools. This theory suggests that unsuccessful school performance is not necessarily caused by a lack of desire on the part of minority youth to attain good grades. Rather, many or even most non-White youth from certain cultural backgrounds often reject mannerisms that are conducive to currying favour with the mostly White teaching force. This is especially the situation for what Ogbu and Simons term *non-voluntary minorities* (1998). Non-voluntary minorities in the USA are African Americans, Hispanics,

and of course Indigenous peoples. Demographics in Saskatchewan indicate that Indigenous youth fit the profile of the non-voluntary minority⁶ (Howe, 2006).

Ogbu (2008) developed a cultural ecological model (CEM) in order to study how different factors such as community and the school itself affect the academic performance of minority youth. When youth from these non-voluntary racial and cultural backgrounds adopt the habits and styles of the dominant White culture, they run the risk of being ostracized by their peers and communities. By extension, for Indigenous youth in Canada who are academically successful in schools, a common perspective is that they have been assimilated into settler society.⁷

In addition to being ridiculed and ostracized by their communities, there are myriad reasons why Indigenous youth are not driven to excel at academics in the school's current curricular format. In Saskatchewan and across Canada there is widespread support for *meritocracy*. This is the belief that through hard work and skill, a person will rise to the station in life that they deserve. There is no allowance for concepts such as the oppression of certain social groups or White privilege. In other words, similar to the colour-blind discourse, meritocracy is power-blind. The following example is a demonstration that meritocracy is a myth that enables privilege to continue to affect all social relations.

Over a decade ago, one of us completed a study in which the social science department heads at ten Vancouver high schools were interviewed, all of whom were White males who had been teaching for at least 10 years (Orlowski 2008). When asked for their thoughts as to why the high school graduation rate for Indigenous students was about half that of non-Indigenous students, nine teachers used variants of

the *cultural-deficit discourse*, putting the onus on the students themselves to adapt to the ways of White people. Some of these discourses included the following: Indigenous students do not value education; they do not have good family role models; and socializing, rather than academics, is their sole inspiration to attend school. Only one teacher pointed to the Eurocentric curriculum and an almost all-White teaching force as likely factors for the lower graduation rate. Similarly, this same teacher was the only one of the ten who said he tried to incorporate Indigenous perspectives when he taught Canadian history, despite the fact that he admitted that he did not understand them very well. All nine of the other teacher-participants simply refused to incorporate Indigenous perspectives. They invoked the importance of the colour-blind curriculum, apparently unaware that such a curriculum is embedded with whiteness as the hegemonic norm. Although we have not interviewed Saskatchewan teachers on these issues, we have no evidence to suggest the thinking of veteran White social science teachers would vary from their BC counterparts. Is this fair to Indigenous students?

There is much research that suggests teacher expectations are crucial in determining the academic performances of students (Dunne and Gazeley 2008; Leroy and Symes 2001). Might this be a factor in the lower graduation rates for Indigenous students? The research is unclear. But one thing is certain, when it comes to the practice of *tracking* or *streaming*, teacher expectations certainly play a role in the academic careers of many Indigenous high school students (Oakes 2005).

In another study one of us conducted, this one with working-class students from five racial backgrounds, we learned that seemingly benign intentions on the part of teachers can have devastating consequences (Orlowski 2011). As a case in point, consider the following description that an Indigenous female grade 12 student participant offered of the time that a possibly well-meaning math teacher moved her from regular Math 8 into the modified Math 8 class:

I had a lot of teachers at [my former high school] who felt sorry for me because they thought I was poor. And I didn't like it. I didn't like the way ... well, they didn't treat me badly, but they treated me differently

6 It is important to note that Indigenous peoples are not considered to be a *minority* in the common usage of the term. The history of colonization experienced by Indigenous peoples in Canada renders their situation to be different from all other minority groups, who are considered to be settlers.

7 Some Indigenous youth who have been academically successful in the K-12 school system and at post-secondary institutions have charted a path that both honours their cultural traditions and accepts ideas and concepts used in mainstream educational settings. Teacher education programs for prospective educators from Indigenous backgrounds at University of British Columbia (NITEP) and the University of Saskatchewan (ITEP) have been developed from this perspective. For more, see Kawagley 2006.

from everybody else. ... In my math class, in grade 8, I kept to myself and I didn't get my work done all the time. That's why they put me into modified math. They didn't really give me a chance. They didn't want to get to know me. They just felt sorry for me. They thought I was stupid and slow. They didn't want to deal with me. There was no extra help like there was for other kids. The math teacher, actually he was pretty nice, but he told me it was going to be better for me in the modified class, and the next thing I knew that's where I was. I didn't understand this would stop me from going to university. [Orlowski 2011, 81]

This excerpt helps to explain how well-intentioned teachers can still play into the dynamics of systemic racism and inadvertently work toward maintaining White hegemony and Indigenous oppression. The student was removed from the regular math course and placed into a "modified math" course, which is less demanding, but poses a major obstacle for admittance into any university program. The decisions around which students go into these less academic streams underscore the gatekeeper role that school personnel have in society. These decisions most often have the effect of masking and perpetuating social and economic inequalities.

Society's acceptance of meritocracy as truth and the practice of streaming should not be surprising when one considers the demographics of students placed into less academic programs. The practice of streaming structures societal inequality because most modified school programs are filled with students from economically, socially, and culturally marginalized families (Oakes 2005; Kelly 1993; James 1990). Moreover, after leaving school, they are also more likely to become members of the working class (Curtis, Livingstone and Smaller 1992). It is clear that adopting meritocracy in the contemporary context is an effective way to maintain traditional social hierarchies and the status quo. Orlowski can attest to Oakes' premise from his own experience teaching in alternative programs for many years. Only a small percentage of the students came from middle-class backgrounds, and although White students were the majority in the mainstream schools, they were a tiny minority in modified and alternative programs.

It is important to realize that these modified and alternative programs are in effect gatekeepers for entrance into university. For most of these students, their life chances and economic futures are severely limited because of this. The situation is exacerbated even more for Indigenous students who go to federally funded First Nations schools, also known as band schools. A study undertaken by a former chief economist for TD Bank found that "First Nations children living on reserve *receive at least 30 percent less funding for their education* as children under provincial jurisdiction" (Porter 2016, emphasis added). This egregious funding discrepancy leads to shortages in various supports for First Nations students attending band schools.

The preceding discussion further highlights the case that there is an education debt to be paid to the Indigenous communities in Saskatchewan. In light of the federal government's broken treaty promises, deployment of colonizing strategies, and reluctance to engage in resource revenue sharing with the First Nations, the current funding shortfalls are particularly contemptible. The next section makes further connections between economics, racism, and educational outcomes in the province of Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan Today and Racialized Poverty

Despite the newfound prosperity generated by the resource boom over the past two decades, Saskatchewan's poverty rate of 15.3 percent remains among the highest in Canada (Hunter, Douglas and Pedersen 2008). Also striking is the fact that this poverty is not distributed evenly across racial lines because, excluding people living on reserves, Indigenous people in Saskatchewan are almost four times as likely to be living in poverty than non-Indigenous (Hunter and Douglas 2006). The situation is even more striking with respect to child poverty. Despite record royalties from potash and other resources, child poverty for Indigenous families in Saskatchewan is a staggering 45 percent, whereas the child poverty rate for non-Indigenous is 13 percent (Douglas and Gingrich 2009). While disadvantage was less pronounced (but still significant) for Métis children at 28.3 percent, an overwhelming 57.9 percent of First Nations children in Saskatchewan regularly go without some of the basic necessities of life (Douglas and Gingrich 2009). This

deprivation has profound, wide-ranging, and long-term effects on children, as Hunter and Douglas (2006) attest:

Poverty can do both immediate and lasting harm to children. Children who grow up in poverty are more likely to lack adequate food, clothing and basic health care, live in substandard housing and poorly resourced neighborhoods, become victims of crime and violence, be less successful in school, suffer ill health and have shortened life spans. [1]

It has long been known that race and social class are major determinants of educational opportunities and achievement as well as future life chances (Bernstein 1977; Bourdieu and Passeron 1977; Oakes 2005). Severe poverty has an even more deleterious effect on educational outcomes in all Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries, including Canada (West 2007).

A large body of research suggests that the pervasive disadvantage experienced by Saskatchewan's Indigenous peoples emanates from, and is reflected in poor educational achievement normalized by the legacy of colonialism (Battiste 2005; Bell 2004; Richards 2008). This legacy has created intergenerational disparities, which impede educational progress among many Indigenous students, leading to the reproduction of low socioeconomic status in succeeding generations. That Indigenous peoples benefit the least from publicly funded education has long been suspected and has recently been proven, but the degree to which race influences educational outcomes has become abundantly clear over the past decade with the collection of detailed data on student achievement by the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education.

Acknowledging that our colonial past continues to inform current disparities requires a painful confrontation with the realities of racial privilege and necessitates a more equitable and ethical distribution of wealth premised on a treaty relationship as the basis for cross-cultural co-habitation. Since the wider resources of the state are critical to the achievement of this outcome, we also conclude that challenging the current neoliberal vision of a limited state in order to revitalize a more activist and redistributive government is an additional prerequisite to the achievement

of a prosperous, shared and harmonious future in the province of Saskatchewan.

The Canadian government now has an opportunity to finally pay back the education debt to the Indigenous peoples of Saskatchewan that it first accrued during the Treaty-making period of the 1870s (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015). Indeed, the Treaty reference to owning the land to the depth of a plough is a cogent and ethical rationale for paying back this education debt. After all, if this statement was to be taken literally, all profits from resource extraction on Treaty 4 and 6 territories should support Indigenous communities. Further actions on the part of the federal government, such as over a century of the enactment of residential school policy and the underfunding of band schools, demonstrate the ethical imperative behind this call to finally pay the education debt owed to the Indigenous peoples of this province. The final section outlines a plan to rectify the grossly unfair conditions and unethical practices pertaining to Indigenous learners in Saskatchewan.

An Outline for Compensatory Funding for Education and Reconciliation

We are calling for targeted funding to improve the educational outcomes of Indigenous peoples in Saskatchewan. The plan for this funding is connected to the notion of community development, and is part of enhancing nation-building. The outline encompasses three different levels: Level One, frontline workers (teachers and educational assistants); Level Two, specialists (educational psychologists, consultants, and after school programs); and Level Three, governance (school board trustees). The most successful strategy to ameliorate educational inequities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students is the *community school*, and this will underpin the outline for this project. Here are some of the details.

A revamped community school model for Indigenous learners will be the base of Level One of this plan. Funding will be used to create a Head Start program within the community school for early childhood education similar to the Head Start program in the US. Ideally, the staff will be educated in Indigenous perspectives and open to engaging with the community. Teachers will be similarly well-educated in Indigenous

ways of knowing and experts in culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings 1995). They will engage in decolonizing teacher practice (Dion, Johnston and Rice 2010). Teacher experts will be hired at the primary grade level (K-3), and the intermediate level (4-7). Subject specialists will be hired at the junior high school level (8-9), and the senior high school level (10-12). All teachers must understand the history of colonization in Saskatchewan. They must first and foremost be caring educators (Kadyschuk 2017). The teacher-to-student ratio will be in line with best practices. The educational assistants will be trained in engaging with students with various special needs such as FAS, FAE, and ADHD. The well-being of these and all Indigenous students cannot be met without adequate funding.

Level Two of the targeted funding will utilize a promising approach known as wraparound services. Wraparound services attempt to improve students' mental and physical health by addressing outside of school issues such as poverty and has shown some success around improved educational outcomes in many jurisdictions in the US (Fries *et al.* 2012). Most often in tandem with the community school model, the wrap-around approach relies on an emphasis on counselling services, after-school programs, and social service support for families in need. In the context of this project, the targeted funding will be used to hire educational psychologists well trained in successful strategies in mental health and student assessment for Indigenous learners. Families and community Elders will be made welcome in the community schools. Counselling psychologists educated in successful approaches to individual and family therapy with Indigenous peoples will be part of the team. After school programs will also be developed to help students and their families living in poverty. An example of this may be basketball leagues for girls and for boys.

Level Three is vitally important to the overall success of this endeavour. The roles and responsibilities of school board trustees must emphasize the importance of decolonizing the curriculum and the school in general. They must provide professional development opportunities for all front-line school personnel, from the school principals, to the teachers and education assistants. The Board must value and respect the Indigenous communities that will be part of the

school, and strive to strengthen partnerships with these communities.

This is only the skeletal outline of a plan to engage with and support Indigenous learners. As mentioned throughout the paper, the main objective is to make the case that an education debt exists in Saskatchewan. By addressing this debt through targeted funding, the achievement gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students should lessen over time.

Conclusions

Acknowledging that our colonial past continues to inform current disparities requires a painful confrontation with the realities of racial privilege and necessitates a more equitable and ethical distribution of wealth premised on a treaty relationship as the basis for cross-cultural cohabitation. It is clear that supporting Indigenous youth in schools cannot be the sole strategy to raise more Indigenous people out of poverty. Indeed, challenging the status quo around governance in the province itself is necessary. Because the wider resources of the state are critical to the achievement of this outcome, a clear conclusion is that confronting the current neoliberal vision of a limited state in order to revitalize a more activist and redistributive government is an additional prerequisite to the achievement of a prosperous, shared, and harmonious future in the province of Saskatchewan.

Paying the education debt, however, is an important contribution to improving the lives of Indigenous peoples in Saskatchewan. There is a historical ethical imperative to address this. As more people in Saskatchewan understand this, the more likely the success of this project.

References

- Barman, Jean. 1995. "Schooled for Inequality: The Education of British Columbia Aboriginal Children." In *Children, Teachers and Schools in the History of British Columbia*, J. Barman, N. Sutherland and J. D. Wilson, eds. Pp 57-80. Calgary: Detselig.
- Battiste, Marie. 2005. *State of Aboriginal Learning*. Canadian Council on Learning. Available at <http://en.copian.ca/library/research/ccl/aboriglearn/aboriglearn.pdf>.
- Bell, David. 2004 *Sharing Our Success: Ten Case Studies of Aboriginal Schooling*. Kelowna: Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education.
- Bernstein, Basil. 1977. *Class, Codes and Control (Vol. 3)*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1977. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Cappon, Paul. 2008. "Measuring Success in First Nations, Inuit, and Métis Learning." *Policy Options*, May: 60-66. <http://irpp.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/po/whither-the-liberals/cappon.pdf>
- Carr-Stewart, Sheila. 2003. School Plus and Changing Demographics in Saskatchewan: Towards Diversity and Educational Communities. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*. 27 (2): 223-234.
- Carter, Sarah. 1993. *Lost Harvests: Prairie Indian Reserve Farmers and Government Policy*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Cottrell, Michael. 2010. "Indigenous Education in Comparative Perspective: Global Opportunities for Reimagining Schools." *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education*, 1(4): 223-227.
- Cottrell, Michael, Jane P. Preston and Joe Pearce. 2012. "The Intersection of Modernity, Globalization, Indigeneity, and Postcolonialism: Theorizing Contemporary Saskatchewan Schools." *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education: Studies of Migration, Integration, Equity, and Cultural Survival*, 6(4): 242-257.
- Curtis, Bruce, D.W. Livingstone and Harry Smaller. 1992. "So Many People: Ways Of Seeing Class Differences In Schooling." In *Stacking the Deck: The Streaming Of Working-Class Kids In Ontario Schools*, B. Curtis, D. W. Livingstone and H. Smaller, eds. Pp. 6–25. Toronto: Our Schools Our Selves.
- Daschuk, James. 2013. *Clearing the Plains: Disease, Politics of Starvation, and the Loss of Aboriginal Life*. Regina: University of Regina Press.
- Davin, Nicholas Flood. 1879. *Report on Industrial Schools for Indians and Half-Breeds*. [Ottawa: Department of Indian Affairs] Available at <http://www.canadiana.ca/view/occihm.03651>.
- Dickason, Olive and David T. McNab. 2008. *Canada's First Nations: A History of Founding Peoples From Earliest Times*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Dion, Susan, Krista Johnston and Carla Rice. 2010. *Decolonizing Our Schools - Aboriginal Education in the Toronto District School Board*. Toronto: York University.
- Douglas, Fiona and Paul Gingrich. 2009. *Child and Family Poverty Saskatchewan Report, November 2009*. University of Regina. Retrieved from <https://campaign2000.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/SKRC2009.pdf>
- Dunne, Málréad and Louise Gazeley. 2008. Teachers, Social Class, and Underachievement. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29: 451–463.
- Frankenberg, Ruth. 1993. *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Friedel, Tracy. 2010. "Finding a Place For Race at the Policy Table: Broadening the Aboriginal Education Policy Discourse in Canada." *Aboriginal Policy Research Initiative: Policy Research Paper Series*. Ottawa: The Institute On Governance, in partnership with the Office of the Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians.
- Fries, Derrick, Karen J. Carney, Laura Blackman-Urteaga, and Sue Ann Savas. 2012. "Wraparound Services: Infusion into Secondary Schools as a Dropout Prevention Strategy." *NASSP Bulletin*. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0192636512443282>.
- Government of Saskatchewan. 2017. "Provincial Graduation Rate Increasing." Government of Saskatchewan website, September 22. <https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/news-and-media/2017/september/22/prov-graduation-rate>.
- Green, Joyce. 2006. From Stonechild to Social Cohesion: Anti-racist Challenges for Saskatchewan. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 39(3): 507–527.
- Howe, Eric C. 2006. "Saskatchewan With an Aboriginal Majority: Education and Entrepreneurship." Public Policy Paper 44. The Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy.
- Hunter, Adam. 2017. "Melfort Journalist's Column Criticized For 'Ignorant' Views On Indigenous People." *CBC News* website, August 2. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/column-from-melfort-journalist-receives-criticism-for-ignorant-views-on-issues-facing-aboriginal-people-1.4232574>

- Hunter, Garson and Fiona Douglas. 2006. Report Card on Child Poverty in Saskatchewan. *Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives—Saskatchewan Notes*, 5(5).
- Hunter, Garson, Fiona Douglas and Sarah Pedersen. 2008. "Will the economic boom reduce poverty in Saskatchewan?" *Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives—Saskatchewan Notes*, 7(3).
- James, Carl E. 1990. *Making It: Black Youth, Racism and Career Aspirations in a Big City*. Oakville: Mosaic Press.
- Kadyschuk, Leanne R. 2017. *Inspired Teaching: An Exploration of Enacting the Curriculum, Deepening Social Justice Consciousness, and Creating an Ethos of Caring in Saskatoon Secondary School Classrooms*. Masters Thesis, University of Saskatchewan. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9cde/d4a4786c2a07f87747959b4c4ab97822ee33.pdf>
- Kelly, Deirdre M. 1993. *Last Chance High: How Girls and Boys Drop in and Out of Alternative Schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kawagley, Oscar. 2006. *A Yupiaq Worldview: A Pathway to Ecology and Spirit*. Long Grove, Ill: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 1995. "Toward a Culturally Relevant Pedagogy." *American Education Research Journal*, 32:465–491.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 2006. "From the Achievement Gap To the Education Debt: Understanding Achievement in U.S. Schools." *Educational Researcher*, 35(7): 3-12.
- Leroy, Carol and Brent Symes. 2001. "Teachers' Perspectives on the Family Backgrounds of Children at Risk." *McGill Journal of Education*, 36 (1): 45–61.
- Miller, J.R. 2009. *Compact, Contract, Covenant: Aboriginal Treaty-Making in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Milloy, John S. 1999. *"A National Crime": The Canadian Government and the Residential School System, 1879 to 1986*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Oakes, Jeannie. 2005. *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality* (2nd ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ogbu, John, ed. 2008. *Minority Status, Oppositional Culture, and Schooling*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ogbu, John and Herbert D. Simons. 1998. "Voluntary and Involuntary Minorities: A Cultural-Ecological Theory of School Performance With Some Implications for Education." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 29 (2): 155-188.
- Orlowski, Paul. 2008. "That Would Certainly Be Spoiling Them": Liberal Discourses on Aboriginal Issues in High School Social Studies. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 31 (2): 110-129.
- Orlowski, Paul. 2011. *Teaching About Hegemony: Race, Class, and Democracy in the 21st Century*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Papillon, Martin and Gina Cosentino. 2004. *Lessons From Abroad: Towards a New Social Model for Canada's Aboriginal Peoples*. Report No. 40. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Pelletier, Terrance, Michael Cottrell and Rosalind Hardie. 2013. *Improving Education and Employment Outcomes For First Nations and Métis People*. SELU, University of Saskatchewan.
- Porter, Jody. 2016. "First Nations Students Get 30 Percent Less Funding Than Other Children, Economist Says." *CBC News* website, March 14. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/thunder-bay/first-nations-education-funding-gap-1.3487822>
- Richards, John. 2008. *A Disastrous Gap: How High Schools Have Failed Canada's Aboriginal Students*. Toronto: C. D. Howe Institute.
- St. Denis, Verna. 2007. "Aboriginal Education and Anti-Racist Education: Building Alliances Across Cultural and Racial Identity." *Canadian Journal of Education*, 30(4):1068–1092.
- Talaga, Tanya. 2019. "Why is Lynn Beyak Still a Senator?" *Toronto Star*, April 2. Retrieved from <https://www.thestar.com/politics/political-opinion/2019/04/02/why-is-lynn-beyak-still-a-senator.html>
- Talbot, Robert. 2009. *Negotiating the Numbered Treaties: An Intellectual and Political History of Alexander Morris*. Vancouver: Purich Press.
- Tobias, John L. 1983. "Canada's Subjugation of the Plains Cree, 1879- 1885." *Canadian Historical Review*, 64 (4): 519-548.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. 2015. *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.
- Tupper, Jennifer. 2012. "Treaty Education for Ethically Engaged Citizenship: Settler Identities, Historical Consciousness, and the Need for Reconciliation." *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 7 (2): 143-156.
- West, Anne. 2007. "Poverty and Educational Achievement: Why Do Children From Low-Income Families Tend to Do Less Well at School?" *Benefits*, 15 (30): 283-297.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 2003. *Empire of Capital*. New York, NY: Verso.

Interview

Manufacturing Consent: A Concern That Lasted 40 Years. Interview with Michael Burawoy¹

Paula Varela
Universidad de Buenos Aires

Michael Burawoy's *Manufacturing Consent* is a must-have book for all those, who, like me, study the so-called "Labour World," particularly what happens within factories. However, Michael Burawoy is much more than the author of that enlightening book.

Born in Manchester in a Jewish family of Russian origin, he has been trying to understand how consent is organized among the dominated for the last 40 years. That was the issue he dealt with in Zambia in 1968, during the post-colonial process, when he got a job in the copper industry and discovered the articulations between the factory regime and racial segregation. From that experience emerged *The Color of Class on the Copper Mines: From African Advancement to Zambianization* (1972).

In 1974, it prevailed again as a concern when, already having become a sociologist, he was employed as a metalworker worker on the outskirts of Chicago and conducted the ethnography that is the basis of *Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labor Process in the Monoplist Capitalism* (1982). This work allowed him to consolidate the idea that it is impossible to

understand what happens in the work place without establishing the relationship between that space and the political-economic context in which it is placed, giving rise to the concept of "Political Regime of Production" that would be deepened in the books *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes Under Capitalism and Socialism* (1985) and *The Radiant Past. Ideology and Reality in Hungary's Road to Capitalism* (1994), based on a comparison between his experience as a worker in Chicago and his experience in Hungary in the 1980s, while this country was under the Soviet orbit.

And it was to explore that idea that he decided to do field work in a factory in Russia in the early 1990's, when the capitalist restoration began. But that same concern was what led him to adopt Marxism as his theoretical point of view and ethnography as his research method, developing a series of theoretical-methodological discussions that can be found in books such as *The Extended Case Method: Four Countries, Four Decades, Four Great Transformations, and One Theoretical Tradition* (1997), or *Sociological Marxism* (2000), written with Eric Olin Wright. In short, Michael Burawoy is a *rara avis* of the American academy: a teacher who walks through classrooms openly calling for a rebuilding of Marxism, a researcher who holds a methodological battle to the death against

¹ This interview has been previously published in Spanish at *Revista Archivos de Historia del Movimiento Obrero y la Izquierda*, año VII, nº 13, septiembre de 2018: 165-177.

inductivism and a sociologist who proposes to rethink the idea of the organic intellectual relating the sociology with anti-capitalist movements.

In March 2018, Burawoy was invited by Indiana University, Bloomington campus, to give a lecture entitled “Marxism engages Bourdieu.” I was there carrying out a research stay at the History Department. Chance caused that, for the first time, I had the possibility of personally listening to someone who had been inspiring for my own ethnographic work. From that first meeting, other subsequent meetings emerged, the result of which is this interview I conducted in his office at the Berkeley University.

Paula Varela: How did you get to enter as a metalworker in the Allied Corporation in Chicago?

Michael Burawoy: What essentially happened was that I was supposed to go back to England after doing my MFA in the University of Zambia. But I didn’t go to England but to the United States which I remembered to be very exciting during my stay there in 1967/1968. I can give a rationalization of why Chicago, but actually it was the one place that accepted me. So I took it and I landed there and, of course, nobody was really interested in Africa when I arrived because Africa was not going the way that they wanted and they had all sorts of explanations for this, about a whole cultural character, which was precisely the sort of theory I was very much opposed to. This was 1972, [Andre] Gunder Frank had already written his articles on development and underdevelopment (Gunder Frank 1966) based on his work on Latin America, which was quite big and had become quite influential in Africa as well as [Franz] Fanon who was trying to understand colonialism through a Marxist lens. This was just the opposite of the sort of argument being made in the United States about the sort of cultural unpreparedness of Africans.

So I thought, “Okay, now I would sort of take them on their own doorstep.” So I went and worked in a factory. Of course I had been interested in industrial sociology in Zambia, but there was now already a Marxist question when I did it: How to make sense of the actual lived experience of workers in a capitalist so-called factory? And, of course, this was an interesting time because this was a time of the renaissance of Marxism, particularly influenced by French Marxism,

French structuralism. And Chicago was not, of course, the heart of Marxism. It was quite the opposite.

But there was this Polish guy in the Political Science Department, Adam Przeworski that had just come back from Paris and was “full of Marxism.” I learned my Gramsci from him, a particular vision of Gramsci. And I suppose that led me to begin to think about “I’m an ethnographer, that’s what I have, that’s how I do the work and how to take these ideas to understand the nature of that working class in the US.” So I entered the factory in 1974. Chicago had this history of ethnography and there had been ethnographies of the workplace. But there were very few ethnographies at that time; the whole tradition had been somewhat abandoned. And I was quite hostile to that whole project of ethnography as it would have been in Chicago because they made a fetish of boundaries. They tried to enclose communities, whether it be through some sort of the railroads or some sort of part. Anyway, they were always trying to enclose that as if it were a village and they could enclose the village.

Now, the Manchester School, which was the anthropology I studied in Zambia, had already said in the 1950s: “Look, you can’t enclose the village, never mind a factory,” and they had asked, “How are we going to study industry with our ethnographic method?” And so they developed this idea of the *Extended Case Method*, which is what I subsequently developed, changing it. Because they were very inductive about it, they were often again materialist Marxists, they didn’t go around calling themselves Marxists, but actually their analysis was a sort of class analysis. Of course, the category class does not appear except, I should be fair, in this one famous book written by a fellow called William Kornblum, *Blue Collar Community* (1975), that did look at the ethnic divisions within this community of steel workers. But there was very little of this analysis and so I decided that I had to try to bring Marxism to the Chicago experience because there were no Marxists really around, except Adam Przeworski, who became very important in my intellectual development. But he thought I was crazy, because he had this macro vision of politics and he was interested in, basically, why socialists never really made it into power through electoral politics and the way electoral politics disorganizes the working class. So he couldn’t understand what I was

doing working in a factory. But anyway, I did it. And I took basically these French Marxists, I took Poulantzas, Althusser and Gramsci into the factory.

PV: It's not very usual the mix between Gramsci and Althusser in the way you did it.

MB: Well there are many connections between them. The most obvious connection is that Althusser was already talking about Ideological State Apparatuses and that was a sort of Gramsci idea to see the State as an ideological formation as one and the same political coercive one. And Gramsci was very focused, unlike many Marxists, on the lived experience of workers and peasants, and so he had a whole analysis of good sense and common sense. And Althusser had something similar: he talked about the importance of ideology understood not as a set of representations or ideas, but as a lived experience. And under capitalism that lived experience mystifies the existence of exploitation, the commodity's fetishism as another lived experience. So this is a very Althusserian view of ideology.

Now I think actually that the French structuralists, Poulantzas, Balibar, Althusser, they were all very Gramscian and they knew it and so they all attack Gramsci for being a historicist (you know, this idea that you have this stage-like theory of the development of class), but most of their ideas can be found in Gramsci in my view. What I'm saying now seems obvious to me and I guess I must have been influenced by Przeworski who also saw this close connection. But it's even closer than he presented it. I don't know if it's a French style, but basically, if you find somebody actually has similar ideas to yourself, then you attack them, rather than build on them, and that's what happened to Gramsci. They took his ideas and then attacked him. Later Bourdieu does something very similar. So I think there's a close connection between Gramsci's ideas about the State and the Marxism debated in France in the nineteen sixties and seventies.

But most of them don't do such empirical ethnographic work. That was something new in my work. Of course, there were people in England who did ethnographies within a Gramscian framework though they were less explicit about it. Somebody like Paul Willis whose studies in education had a very similar framework; he's very influenced by Gramscian ideas.

Stuart Hall is obviously another one very influenced by Gramsci. They wouldn't find it so strange that there will be ethnographies of communities or workplaces with a Gramscian framework. In France they probably would. And in the United States, for a different reason, they were too: because of this love of the Chicago school that is so inductive and this idea that you don't bring theory to the ethnography, this idea that Marxism probably wouldn't do much of an ethnography. That's not true, but it's usually exceptional to bring Marxism to ethnography.

It is interesting, the sociologists usually in France see the Chicago School as the most significant school of Sociology in the US and it is, I think, because of its Grounded Theory, this idea that you get truth by actually immersing yourself in the world. What is missed is a broader context within which that lived experience is shaped. So I was very much opposed to both: the anti-theorism of the Chicago School and the idea of enclosed communities. And I tried to sort of remedy that by the way I studied this factory, by putting theory at the centre of the analysis and also seeing it in the broader context of capitalism. I had done this study in Zambia, on the reproduction of the racial order within the copper mines, which also looked at the ways that blacks succeeded and replaced whites. And I had put that in the broader context of postcolonial Zambia, but it was less self-consciously theoretical. Now I became much more self-consciously theoretical and Marxism was the theory that I was trying to develop. Bringing these theories of the State into the factory, and sort of taking note of what Gramsci had said in the United States that hegemony is born in the factory. So those were the two prongs of that ethnography: to bring theory to bear directly and self-consciously to the empirical world, and to see that empirical world in its broader context.

PV: Do you think that Gramsci's idea that "the hegemony is born in the factory" is still right? Does this analysis remain correct in the current situation of the working classes?

MB: Well, I don't know if I thought it was even correct then. I mean, it was certainly correct for the monopoly sector of the economy at that time. These institutions that I talked about: the Internal State and the Internal

Labour Market, and the way these games are played, that was a characteristic of a particular sector of the economy where the trade unions were strong, where there was a sort of protected arena where you could effectively organized consent. At the competitive sector, which was much more precarious employment, it was much more difficult to organize consent and there you're more likely to get despotic work organizations. In the context of Africa that I've talked about, I wrote about political regime in the workplace; I called it Colonial Despotism. So, again, I was trying to be so specific about this factory in this moment. I was not saying that consent is organized in all factories everywhere, but actually somewhat uniquely in this advanced capitalism. I felt this would last for much longer than it did it. Actually, as soon as I studied it, it more or less disappeared in the 1980s. I think it's still important to study what the Political Regime in production is. But I think it's hard to sustain, in the way that I did in the seventies, that the factory is a central place for the organization of consent. The conditions are so different now at workplaces, so you might say that today, as I sometimes do, it's a privileged to be exploited. There are so few stable working class positions, wage labour positions, that actually workers tend to be much more quiescent, at least around them. And whether that's consent or whether it's a form of compliance, that's an interesting question. That is the story of today, right? The rise of a more precarious employment in ever greater areas of the economy, including the university.

So, I think that with this idea of hegemony born in the factory, Gramsci was talking about Fordism. I don't know what he was talking about really, but he did say that, so my role was to figure out what it meant and I think that he captured something about Fordism and he captured something significant about the United States, because Gramsci has always been historically specific. So he captured something about the US: that the absence of so called Feudalism really made a huge difference as to where consent and where class struggle will take place.

PV: You mentioned the relationship between theory and empirical work. That is a very tortuous relationship for the sociologists who carry out study cases, and even

more, for ethnographic approaches. Could you explain in which way you mix them in your work?

MB: I spent a lot of time over the last 40 years in this department [Sociology Department at Berkeley University] combating the idea that, somehow, ethnography is privileged because it has direct access to the facts and, somehow, that is the power of ethnography. I've always said that there are no facts as such. If I were to sit down now and describe this room in this interview, I could do it for the rest of my life. Only when I have some sort of focus, some sort of set of questions, some lens, I can actually begin to do it in a finite time. So we cannot avoid actually bringing some sort of lens to the empirical world that we study, and in fact, if we don't have a lens, then the whole world looked blurred. So this is what happens in reality that we all carry with us, implicitly or explicitly, a body of theory that helps us make sense of the world around us.

So that is my point of departure about the relationship of theory to input: you cannot comprehend, apprehend the empirical world, without some theoretical lens. My first step is to say: theory is the essence of understanding what is going on. So I've always argued against those who say that somehow you have to go to a field site and wipe all the theory out of your head and see the world. It's a project that is impossible, but it's not only impossible, it's wrong-headed in my view, when the idea is to recognize what is in your head rather than to eliminate what is in your head.

So, if that's the point of departure, that we all carry theory with us, the point is to build theory and to work on the shoulders of others, and to do what I call *reconstruct theory*. Because, what is theory? Theory is the accumulated knowledge amongst academics or non-academics that we sort of recognize as emergent, and it implicitly calls our attention to the fact that we are a community of scholars that work together to build this knowledge. Then, we should work with it and advance it rather than going into the field science to start all over again and reinvent the wheel. The idea is actually to work with what exists, so that is the idea of rebuilding theory. This idea has got a proven body of thinking in the history of science and in the philosophy of science associated first and foremost, I suppose with Khun, but then the person who's influenced me most probably was a fellow called Imre Lakatos and

the work in Research Programs. It's still not necessarily the most accepted way of thinking about science, but is the correct way in my view. In this Department there is a view that you can do ethnography that is not just inductive, that is, that you can bring history in ethnography together, if you have a body of theory that helps you do that. But when I arrived here, 40 years ago, everybody thought: how can you be a Marxist? Ethnographers cannot be Marxists, they do historical work and ethnographers do micro work. I think that nobody would say that to me today.

PV: Speaking about Lakatos, you've written a very particular text (Burawoy 1989) in which you make a comparison between Theda Skocpol's and León Trotsky's analyses of revolutionary processes as an expression of the way each other conceive the theoretical accumulation (Skocpol as an example of an Inductivist way of thinking the theoretical accumulation and Trotsky as an example of Lakatos' Research Programs way of thinking on the theoretical accumulation). When I first read it, it looked like really weird to me because it is so usual that scholars think about Trotsky from an epistemological point of view. Why did you choose the Trotsky's Permanent Revolution Theory as an example of Lakatos' point of view about how theory can be built and rebuilt?

MB: Well, the text is more about Skocpol than about Trotsky. Skocpol became a major figure in macro sociology in the eighties. And actually I had collaborated with her and she adopted a sort of Marxist mantle. She was a student of Barrington Moore who was a major figure who had already written the book *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*, published in 1965. It was a major breakthrough in the study of politics, nobody had done anything quite like this before, and it was really putting the United States in a much broader historical geographical context, comparing different roads to modernity, comparing actually the history of nine states. And he was a Soviet Union expert. Soviet Union was really what was going on in his head because he was trying to show that, actually, all the hostility to the Soviet Union, Cold War hostility, based on the fact that it was a totalitarian regime, did not take into account the historical context in which the Soviet

Union emerged. He was trying to show that, yes, there was violence in the creation of the Soviet Union, but there was also violence in the creation of the road to democracy. That's what's in his mind. So he was fighting a political battle, not justifying totalitarianism, but being much more critical of the west and of political sociology that by that time was sort of celebrating the wonders of the United States.

People like Seymour Martin Lipset and his "Political Man" (1960) is all about the wonders of liberal America. Of course, that all must be placed in the after nineteen sixties context. On that point, Barrington Moore became a major figure and Skocpol was a student of Barrington Moore. So I expected her to be a sort of Marxist. But when you look more carefully at the writings, they are basically a story about the State (the State was at the center of a lot of debates at the time in the 1960s), and she became identified with the view that the State should be seen as an autonomous platform, and be studied as such. And she became a sort of a more subtle critique of Marxism. So, I felt I had to take her on and what better person to take her on than Trotsky? Because it turns out that basically Skocpol had a very inductive theory: there are successful and unsuccessful revolutions and the successful ones are the Russian, the Chinese and the French, and the unsuccessful ones are the German, the Japanese and the English. So she does this sort of multiple regression in history, seeing what the conditions for a successful process are. And Trotsky also has the attempt to understand why the French Revolution is successful and the German is unsuccessful and the Russian is a sort of success. But Trotsky's central view is that you can't look at these independently, they are all part of an evolving global capitalist system. Skocpol completely suppresses that. So it seemed to me to be a very interesting debate between the two, I mean, from my point of view, though she of course wouldn't agree. I don't know if she actually read much of Trotsky, not much evidence that she had.

So I used that to actually think about the meaning of science, sociologist science and the meaning of theory. She represented this inductive approach I'd also been critical of in the context of ethnography. She did some comparative historical work which was indeed important, but missed the connections between these

revolutions and their overall context within which they placed, when Trotsky was incredibly sensitive to that. The Permanent Revolution Theory and the Uneven and Combined Theory show that sensitivity, and were, in my point of view, a rebuild of Marxist Theory. And what is interesting about Trotsky is that *The History of the Russian Revolution*, that book, is an ethnography of the Russian revolution. So he understood this link between the experience and the broader macro forces that are at work in a way that very few have. And of course I put it in the context of the development of Marxism, that Trotsky was a very crucial player in that, which was not necessarily a common view.

PV: How do you see the rebuilding of theory at this time? You used to talk about the crisis of University, on the one hand, and the opportunity for a rebuilding of Sociology Science, on the other hand, linked to the idea of a Public Sociology. But you differentiate your meaning of Public Sociology from Boudieu's one.

MB: Right, this "public sociology thing" is another strange thing. That came about because I went back to South Africa in 1991, and I found a sociology that in Argentina was probably normal and natural, but not in the United States; it was a sociology with which people were engaged. I mean sociologists were actually, not all of them, but many of them were engaged in the battle against the Apartheid Regime and as such they will do it. So as sociologists they were teaching at the same time as engaging politically and were developing quite a regional sociology. And I've just never seen a sociology like this, having spent so much time in the United States because I got used to this sort of very professional sociology, in which sociologists write things, even when it's about Skocpol and Trotsky, and perhaps one or two other people will read it, certainly nobody outside the academy will read it and you just take this as normal. It is a professional sociology in which we just exchange papers.

I remember when Cardoso was here in 1980 or 1981 he always laughed about the way that the American Sociology or American Academics operates: they make all these brave revolutionary statements, but, you know, nobody reads it so it doesn't matter. But where he comes from if you start making revolutionary statements, and of course he was talking about the

period of the dictatorship, then you might get into trouble.

So, in 1994 I became Chair of this Department and decided that we were a Public Sociology because this department of all departments in the United States have the most engaged sociologists, engaged in the world beyond the academy. So I decided I would push this idea of quote "Public Sociology" and my colleagues have since regretted this, but nevertheless, that's what happened. And the idea was to actually compare the Public Sociology in contrast with this Professional Sociology, and the inspiration originally come from South Africa. But then I thought "well, perhaps there are different types of Public Sociology." So I took this Gramscian distinction, though I never really refer to Gramsci, between traditional and organic, to think about a Traditional Public Sociology and an Organic Public Sociology, and I think what most people were doing in my department here was a Traditional Public Sociology. They communicated through the media, through the books they wrote to the broader public beyond the academy.

But there was also an Organic Public Sociology which has an unmediated relationship between the sociologist or the academy, and the community. And of course that was the one that Gramsci also emphasized, but only on a collective level, not on an individual level. A Gramsci organic intellectual is one who can elaborate what he called the "good sense" of the working class. Here there is a kernel: the working class, by virtue of its collective transformation, they understand the world, the subordinate classes can understand the world. There is some good sense, there is infiltrated with the ideology but nevertheless there is a good sense. So there is something for intellectuals to do: they've got this good sense they can work with. In Bourdieu there's no good sense, there's only bad sense. The working class has only bad sense, they cannot understand the conditions of its own subjugation and therefore it's hopeless. Therefore intellectuals, in a sense, must themselves transform the world. Intellectuals, as I understand it, are the ones that are going to have a progressive presence. But not all the intellectuals, you can be sure about that.

Many of the intellectuals suffer what Marxists would call a "false consciousness"; they have been subject to scholastic fallacies, so it turns out that only very

few sociologists, particularly one's around Bourdieu, can really understand the world, perhaps only Bourdieu. But anyway, this idea that the intellectual is the transformative agent as opposed to the dominated, that's why I think that Gramsci would see Bourdieu as a traditional intellectual, critical of the world around, but that critique is in itself not challenging the actual totality. In fact, the traditional intellectual, by virtue of being critical, appears to be autonomous and can present a universal picture, whereas the organic intellectual is closely connected to some sort of class that will be transformative, a subordinate class that will be transformative.

So Gramsci would see Bourdieu as a traditional intellectual and himself as an organic intellectual. Bourdieu, on the other hand, would see Gramsci as a deluded believer in the myth of the organic intellectual and misguided in thinking that the working class have this emancipatory role. Empirically it's not altogether clear who is right, but politically one has one's propensities. Anyway, that's the big difference between the two that they do represent in a sense two different types of Public Sociology. But I think there's a lot more at stake and it all revolves around where truth comes from: for Gramsci, truth comes from the experience of the working class as it transforms nature; for Bourdieu, truth ultimately comes from the existence of intellectuals who engage in a field of competition and produce truth. And so they have a different vision of truth and that has enormous political implications.

PV: Regarding this idea of Organic Intellectual, I would like to know how you think about the relationship between Marxism and its political implications nowadays. You've made a sort of periodization of Marxism in the last 150 years: the Classic Marxism, the Russian Marxism, the Occidental Marxism, the Third World Marxism and, currently, you say that this is the moment of a "Sociological Marxism." But I cannot quite fathom what "Sociological Marxism" is, because the other Marxisms you talk about, are linked to different moments of the rise of class struggle (or defeats, as Perry Anderson says about "Occidental Marxism"). So, what organic class movement or class struggle is the Sociological Marxism linked to? Isn't the idea of a "Sociological Marxism" a sort of contradictions in terms?

MB: Very good. Yes, it's very contradictory what I'm saying. That's absolutely correct. Is this Sociological Marxism somehow organically connected? What does that mean? I would present it this way: it means to bring back the social to the centre. Marxism, in the first place, had emphasized the economy: somehow the economy would sow the seeds of its own destruction. The second position was a State-centred vision of socialism. So, what is left out is a Marxism that centres the social. And of course I draw on Polanyi and I draw on Gramsci to actually sort of stress the importance of a vision of socialism that is based on the collective self-organization of civil society, that's what the Sociological Marxism is.

PV: Where do you put Trotsky's Marxism in this classification?

MB: I would put Trotsky in the State socialism basically. It's tricky because his Marxism was not Soviet Marxism, but I think that Trotsky's vision of socialism was ultimately State driven, the working class is important and of course Trotsky changes his mind over time, but still I think his contribution is the recognition of the centrality of the State and doesn't do an elaborated analysis of the way the classes get shaped by civil society. Of course, after the [Russian] revolution, the only issue is how to figure out basically building hegemony from above. So his analysis of Russia post revolution, his critique of Stalin, his proposals for the Transitional Program, they're all very state driven. I think that's also implicit in his earlier writings, because he's not one who believes somehow that the economy will sow the seeds of its own destruction. You could argue that he has some sort of analysis of civil society, there's a very slender one. Gramsci puts that forward as the central feature of advanced capitalism. I don't think Trotsky sees civil society as being so crucial in demanding a whole different vision of revolution as Gramsci says is necessary.

Anyway, Sociological Marxism is the centering of the social and centering of so called civil society and its collective reorganization. But the point is a good one: of course that Sociological Marxism is rather an academic project and these other Marxisms, or many of them, are actually developed in close contact with a mobilized working class. So to talk about Sociological Marxism may be a sort of a contradiction in terms in the sense

that Marxism has to be somehow something developed in close connection with the dominated. But I would say that my friend Eric Olin Wright develops his ideas of real utopias and in a sense that is an expression of the Sociological Marxism and in principle it should be developed in close connection with those who are engaged in building alternative institutions to challenge capitalism, whether they be, I don't know, participatory budgeting or whether they'd be cooperatives, they have a potential to challenge capitalism, and one gets to know them and one can disseminate their ideas through actually engaging with people who are actually trying to build these alternative institutions. So if one takes his project seriously, it does bring Sociological Marxism into contact with those who are building alternative institutions. That's my defense, I guess.

References

- Burawoy, Michael. 1972. *The Color of Class on the Copper Mines: From African Advancement to Zambianization*. Manchester University Press.
- Burawoy, Michael. 1982. *Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labor Process in the Monopolist Capitalism*. University of Chicago Press.
- Burawoy, Michael. 1985. *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes Under Capitalism and Socialism*. London: Verso.
- Burawoy, Michael. 1989 "Two Methods in Search of Science: Skocpol versus Trotsky." *Theory and Society* 18(6):759-805.
- Burawoy, Michael. 1994. *The Radiant Past. Ideology and Reality in Hungary's Road to Capitalism*. University of Chicago Press.
- Burawoy, Michael. 1997. *The Extended Case Method: Four Countries, Four Decades, Four Great Transformations, and One Theoretical Tradition*. University of California Press.
- Burawoy, Michael. and Erik Olin Wright, 2000. *Sociological Marxism*. Online at <https://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/SocMarx.pdf>
- Gunder Frank, Andre. 1966. "The Development of Underdevelopment." *Monthly Review* 18(4):7-31.
- Kornblum, W. 1975. *Blue Collar Community*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lipset, S. M. 1960. *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*. Doubleday & Company..

Argument

Foundations of Post-capitalist Society in Marx's *Capital*

Ali Javaherian

Introduction

According to Mr. Wagner, Marx's theory of value is the cornerstone of his socialist system. As I have never established a "socialist system," this is a fantasy of Wagner. (Notes on Adolph Wagner, 1881 Marx and Engels 1975 24, 533).

From a very young age Karl Marx had grasped that an *a priori* construction of a future society is a useless endeavour, which would bring no other result than dogmatic thinking and the nowhere-land of a nirvana. In 1843, in a letter to Arnold Ruge, Marx wrote that instead of constructing the future our task should be "ruthless critique of all that exists" (Marx and Engels 1975 3, 142). From *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* to *The Critique of Political Economy*, (the subtitle of *Capital*), both in theory and practice critique was always the foundation of Marx's thinking. But Marx's means of critique is a subject that has generated different interpretations among post-Marx-Marxists.

Many, especially in our age, reference the "Theses on Feuerbach" as having transcended philosophical critique. They take Marx's expression "philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point is to *change* it" (Marx and Engels 1975 5, 5) and transformed it into a revolutionary article of faith. As

if Marx, having written that, had wasted forty years of his life in writing *Capital*. At the same time, many other Marxists, who reference the same Theses and who single out *praxis*, often do not understand that Marx's critique of pure objectivism and the singling out of the active side or subjectivity was meant to unify the subject and object for a new beginning. The simultaneous emphasis on practical-critical activity does not mean that the revolutionary act is bereft of the theoretical dimension or that thought is bereft of the practical dimension.

Perhaps restating Marx's expression from his Doctoral Dissertation could help. There Marx states that in the history of philosophy there are nodal points when a philosophy that has been perfected in itself turns to the outside world: "But the *practice* of philosophy is itself *theoretical*. It is the *critique* that measures the individual existence by the essence, the particular reality by the Idea" (Marx and Engels 1975 1,85). Presenting such a concept of critique is an opening toward the critique of political economy in *Capital*. Here the dual movement of dialectical critique "in its rational form ... regards every historically developed form, as being in a fluid state, in motion, and therefore grasps its transient aspect as well; and because it does

not let itself be impressed by anything, being in its very essence critical and revolutionary” (Marx 1977, 103).

The burden of this essay is to prove the claim that Marx’s *Capital* in its critique of the bourgeois science of political economy not only transcends (*aufhebung*) it, but also projects the theoretical foundation of post-capitalist society. After the publication of *Capital*, Marx says the positivist circles were attacking him because he was “on the one hand treating economics metaphysically, and, on the other hand – imagine this! – confining myself merely to the critical analysis of the actual facts, instead of writing recipes (Comtist ones?) for the cookshops of the future” (Marx 1977, 99). The truth is *Capital* is such a different and innovative work that its publication (1867) generated much chaos among economists. Their contradictory reaction demonstrated that one cannot measure such a work with empirical methods of classical political economy. How can one call such a work, at one and the same time, “inductive” and “analytic,” both “realistic” and “metaphysical,” both “idealistic” and “materialistic”? Marx asks: how can one criticize *Capital* for on the one hand lacking freedom in material and empirical matters and, on the other hand, being Hegelian sophistry?

Is there any other work besides *Capital* that has combined political economy with class struggle? What other work has treated every economic category in light of its impact on the working class and the peoples of the colonial world? Substantial parts of *Capital* are devoted to the struggle for the shortening of the working day, the battle of workers with the machine, the “despotic spirit” of the factory and contradictory processes. History (including the history of technology), anthropology, law and its historical development, revolution and economics have all been projected as a unity, a concrete totality, and critiqued. Marx himself said when this concrete totality has been investigated and presented, that is, when the life process of a subject has been critically analyzed and then theoretically expressed in the idea, then “it may appear as if we have before us an *apriori* construction” (Marx 1977, 102).

If we view *Capital* in this conceptual framework, we can echo Marx’s words that the age of political economy as a science has come to an end (Marx 1977, 97). What has replaced it is not a new science but a whole new continent of thought whose beginning and end

is the emancipation of human society from under the domination of an aimless and apparently autonomous dead material world.

Where to Begin?

Beginnings are always the most difficult because the beginning is only truly new if within it contains and carries also the end. In my view, labour, its relationship with the origin, development and future of human society, is a critical category that forms the core of Marx’s continent of thought. Labour whether in its general form, which includes all human societies, or whether in its particular forms in various historical formations, specifically under capitalist relations, is the key to the solution of the mystery of “necessity and freedom.”

In the first place labour is a process between the human being and nature – the process in which humanity’s practice mediates and regulates its metabolism with nature. Human beings set in motion natural forces that belong to their organism, to their hand and head, in order to appropriate the materials of nature to satisfy their need. Through this activity, through this interaction with external nature, they change both nature and their own nature. They awaken the potentialities that are slumbering within nature and give them actuality (Marx 1977, 283).

Human relationship with labour is one that begins in the head. At the end of the labour process a conclusion is reached that was perceived from the beginning by the producer and therefore had “an ideal presence” (Marx 1977, 284). The human not only changes the forms of natural materials but also actualizes her own aims in that transformation. The human is aware, or is conscious of such an aim. This aim is the determinant of the form of the human’s activity. The human’s will, too, is determined with such an aim and idea. The entire labour process needs such a conscious will. As Marx himself put it: “The less he’s attracted by the nature of the work and the way it has to be accomplished, and the less, therefore, he enjoys it as the free play of his own physical and mental powers, the closer his attention is forced to be” (Marx 1977, 284).

Marx divides the elements of the simple labour process into three parts: 1) purposeful activity or the labour itself; 2) the object or material of labour; 3) the

instruments of labour. In the labour process human action, mediated by instruments of labour, transforms the object of labour according to a predetermined idea. The result of this process is the product that satisfies a human need by changing the form of the object of labour. Labour and its object inter-merge – labour is objectified and the object is appropriated. Labour is the active side, the restless form or subjectivity, and the object is the passive and the constant, immobile dimension of the labour process. In this process of “becoming,” the object is the “being” and the product is the “determined being,” i.e. the negated form of its previous being. This “determinate being” contains a quality that is negated again through human productive consumption. This process of negation of the negation is an infinite movement that absorbs the finite object and results in human affirmation in her becoming for herself. As Marx puts it:

Living labour must seize on these things, awaken them from the dead, change them from merely possible into real and effective use-values. Bathed in the fire of labour, appropriated as part of its organism, and infused with vital energy for the performance of the functions appropriate to their concept and to their vocation in the process, they are indeed consumed, but to some purpose, as elements in the formation of new use-values, new products, which are capable of entering into individual consumption as means of subsistence or into a new labour process as means of production. [Marx 1977, 289-90]

When Marx states that human labour awakens the dead, he also means that labour transforms nothingness into a determinate being. Being and nothing are a unity of opposites that become determinant being through the process of becoming. It must be remembered that in order to prove that labour-power is the only factor or element that produces surplus value, Marx conceives constant capital as zero ($C=0$). In other words, by abstracting from constant capital Marx transforms the material into immaterial. Marx assumes the dead labour that resides in the material and instruments of production as “naught” (Marx 1977, 525), because they transfer all of their value directly to the product without adding an iota of surplus value. Instead Marx focuses on variable capital or living, mobile and fluid

labour. It appears as though labour creates “something from nothing!” (Marx 1977, 525).

A concept of labour as the metabolism between humans and nature is a general concept applicable to all human societies. However, to grasp the capitalist relations of production one must go from identity to difference in order for its specificity to become transparent. Under capitalism the relation between labour and the object of labour undergoes a “dialectical inversion”:

It is no longer the worker who employs the means of production but the means of production which employ the worker. Instead of being consumed by him as material elements of his productive activity they consume him as the ferment of their own life-process. [Marx 1977, 425]

Here we have the domination of the past or dead labour over living labour. It is the empire of the dead! Instead of living labour affirming itself in the labour process, material and instruments of labour absorb it into their body and like a leech suck the life-blood of the living labourer. The domination of capital over living labour is the domination of the product over the producer. It is “the inversion of subject into object and *vice versa*,” i.e., the domination of things over the human beings. The goal is the self-valorization of capital. “What we are confronted by here is the alienation of man from his own labour” (Marx 1977, 990).

The capitalist as the personification of capital is a slave to capitalist relationships, just as the worker is. The difference is that in the process of alienation the capitalist finds satisfaction whereas the worker is the victim and stands up to it like a rebel. Therefore, even though capital is not a thing, under capitalism “specific social relations of production between people appear as relations of things to people” (Marx 1977 166, 1005), which means “the personification of things and the reification of persons” (Marx 1977 209, 1056).

Clearly, the capitalist social relationship completely disrupts the metabolic reciprocity between humans and nature. At the same time it prevents the regeneration of vital elements of nature such as air, soil and water and does away with the physical and mental health and well-being of urban and rural workers. For Marx, the restoration of that metabolism as “a regulative law of social production, and in a form adequate to the full

development of the human race” (Marx 1977, 638) is one of the main foundations of post-capitalist society. But before we enter such a society it is necessary together with Marx to enter the production process in order to grasp the depth of his positive critique of labour in contemporary society.

Division of Labour, Machine-ism and Alienated Labour

Marx does not consider the machine “in-and-for-itself.” What is of primary importance to him is the impact of the machine and technology on the human. In capitalist production the machine is the material manifestation of capital. The machine system in its capitalist form has an independent and alien relationship to the producer which then “develops into a complete and total antagonism” (Marx 1977, 558). The machine not only becomes a competitor to the worker and constantly makes the worker superfluous but is also a power inimical to the worker.

As opposed to Proudhon’s uncritical attitude towards the machine as a “synthesis of instruments of different partial operations for the benefit of the worker himself” (Marx 1977, 547), Marx was of the opinion that the entry of machines into the production process is the separation of the objective element from the “subjective principle” (Marx 1977, 502). The growth and expansion of the machine system establishes a spiritless cooperation. The means of production act like a huge “automaton” that is self-acting and has no need for human beings. They act like a “mechanical monster with demonic powers” (Marx 1977, 503). Inside the factory, a “mitigated jail,” there exists an inherent contradiction. Factory work exhausts the nervous system, negates the multi-faceted functions of muscles and transforms both the physical and mental activity into “labour-time personified.” The human’s body, which performs through the division of labour a specialized or monotonous activity, becomes the one-dimensional means of those independent operations as if the constant repetition of an activity confined in such a narrow way becomes the “life-long destiny” of the human being (Marx 1977, 459).

The continuous repetition of this kind of work disrupts the fluid movement of the human being’s vital energy precisely because it is in the diversity of activity

that the human being feels a sense of happiness and enjoyment. However, the fusion of specialization with the entire production mechanism forces the human being to adapt to the ceaseless and regular movement of the machine. Workers throughout their lives get appended to this kind of labour which results in distorted development of their muscles and bones. Such a narrow activity bars human beings from mutual interactions that have a deep content. Factory work “develops a one-sided specialty to perfection at the expense of a man’s working capacity” (Marx 1977, 470). By transforming the method of the individual’s work machine-ism mutilates the independent worker and transforms him into a motor of an automatic and well-regulated operation. The human being becomes an appendage to the machine, “a crippled monstrosity” (Marx 1977, 481). Citing David Urquhart, Marx then calls the sub-division of the human being the “assassination of a people” (Marx 1977, 485).

It is here that workers’ voices inter-merge with Marx’s critique in *Capital*. Marx declares that this kind of work is the “martyrology” of the worker. Workers scream out loud “stop the machines” at least during the meal period. Reduce labour-time and the working-day. Hence, “In the place of the pompous catalog of the ‘inalienable rights of man’ there steps the modest Magna Carta of the legally limited working day, which at last makes clear ‘when the time which the worker sells is ended, and when his own begins’” (Marx 1977, 416). After having gone through the process of confrontation and destruction of the machine the workers then reach “the theoretically quite correct assertion that the only remedy was to work short time” (Marx 1977, 561). This is the beginning of the period which Marx called a “protracted civil war.”

The paradox of machine-ism is a dialectical inversion: the greatest means for shortening of the working time becomes a means that turns the entire life of the worker into working time. By analyzing all the diverse spheres of production Marx proves that the aim of machinery is not to reduce the suffering of the human being. Quite the contrary, machine production becomes the most ruthless means of intensified exploitation and prolongation of the working day beyond the natural capability of a human being. Large-scale machine production creates within the factory an

organized and planned cooperation between the instruments of production – a complete or total productive organism that is outside the control of the producers. The name for this specific form is the “despotic” plan of capital (Marx 1977, 450). The idea that capital plans is not in question. The issue is that the movement is one-sided in a singular direction that does away with the multi-directional development of the producer. Accumulation for the sake of accumulation, production for the sake of production! This is an aimless process whose beginning and end is production, an absolute and infinite movement of valorization whose aim is within its own self (Marx 1977, 253).

This objective movement appears to be autonomous. Its “mode of existence become[s] adequate to its concept” (Marx 1977, 241). Its self-identity has attained an independent form. Marx emphasizes that the writings of ordinary economists’ “crude obsession with the material side, ignore all differences of form” (Marx 1977, 683). This form is a pure despotic form of organization. Hence even though all the means and materials of production are themselves the objectified result of past labour created by human beings, as soon as the workers enter the workplace they are confronted with an objectivity that is pre-constructed. So for the workers the mutual relationship between living and dead labour “confronts them in the realm of ideas, as a plan drawn up by the capitalist, and, in practice, as his authority, as the powerful will of a being outside them who subjects their activity to his purpose” (Marx 1977, 450).

But the capitalist is “capital personified” and capital is not property but command over labour-power: “capital is not a thing, but a social relation between persons which is mediated through things” (Marx 1977, 932). This process is despotic in form whose content is the enslavement and self-alienation of the worker in the production process. As Marx used to say the Roman slave was attached to his master with chains but the “wage-labourer is bound to his owner by invisible threads” (Marx 1977, 719). The sale of apparently free labour-power in the market and the pure lie of a legal contract conceals the real relationship of labour and capital. The master is not a single capital but the collective aggregation of the entire existing capital. Whether the workers’ wages are high or low before the worker

enters the production process his labour has become alienated from him, objectified during the production process and transformed into a product alien to him.

As Marx put it, “the social combination of labour processes appear as the organized suppression of his individual vitality, freedom and autonomy” (Marx 1977, 638). What now needs to be examined are the theoretic foundations Marx developed as an alternative. The context of such an alternative is implicit in the very critique of capitalist social relations, but *Capital* goes beyond the critique of these relations and presents a positive perspective of post-capitalist society.

Cooperation, Communal Labour and “Universal Labour”

We saw that the capitalist mode of production is not without practical and conscious planning. At the same time we saw that the immediate process of production acts as a vast automaton with mechanical and mental organs. These organs carry uninterrupted and coordinated actions all of which are subordinated to a central prime moving mechanism that is automated and self-regulating. In such a process the role of subject and object has been inverted as if the subject is the automaton itself and the human beings are purely conscious organs that have adapted themselves to the unconscious organs of the automaton in such a way that both of those organs together obey the prime mover. Such is the specificity of the capitalist machine. Everything is centred on the machine. As Marx would say, this automaton is personified by the autocratic rule of the capitalist who executes its “purely despotic” plan (Marx 1977, 450).

Regulation and cooperation of the machines is necessary for such an automatic mechanism. The internal tendency of this autocracy is the equalization and levelling of all types of labour and its transformation into a general abstract labour. Abstraction from quality, abolition of inequality and negation of individuality is one of its characteristics (Marx 1977, 440). In such a context, cooperation is spiritless and alienated from the human being.

In general, cooperation is the necessary element of any production on a large scale which in and of itself does not define or represent a specific form or an epoch of production (such as historical ones in Egypt and the

Asiatic form). Nevertheless, cooperation is a fundamental form of capitalist production. Capitalism in fact is a form of collective or direct social production which at one and the same time generates competition between individuals and engenders “animal spirits” (Marx 1977, 447). Here organization and anarchy complement each other. Marx calls this an “animal kingdom” or the “war of all against all” and atomization of the individual (Marx 1977, 477).

At the same time, as indicated earlier, the communal form of capitalist labour carries within itself an antagonistic contradiction: in that the worker exists for the production process and not the production process for the worker. It has no need for the creativity and intelligence of the worker. Quite the contrary, capital becomes productive when the mind of the worker is the “least consulted” (Marx 1977, 483). Capitalist division of labour attacks the very mind of the worker and transforms thinking itself into a peculiar profession. In essence communal labour by itself is not at all a way to measure a free society. That is why when Marx analyses communal ownership within primitive societies his focus is on the lack of individual freedom. Here “the individual has as little torn himself free from the umbilical cord of his tribe or community as a bee has from his hive” (Marx 1977, 452).

Thus it is necessary to dispel the myth that for Marx transcendence of capitalist relations meant only the abolition of private property and the ushering of cooperative or communal labour. The same must be said about the illusion regarding technology and science. In Marx’s view, in post-capitalist society “the field of application of machinery would be entirely different” (Marx 1977, 515). Due to the division of labour “the knowledge, judgment and will ... are faculties that are now required only for the workshop as a whole” (Marx 1977, 482). Intellectual capacities of the material process of production are superior powers that belong to an other and rule over the worker. This separation of manual and mental labour appears as the unified will of an alien social organism which reaches its apex in automation. Science is “a potentiality for production which is distinct from labour and presses it into the service of capital” (Marx 1977, 482). The “thinkers” and productive workers become totally separated from each other and knowledge instead of being at the service of

workers everywhere, stands against the human being. “Knowledge” becomes a means that is an adversary of the worker.

Capital for its valorization process not only absorbs labour-power but the entire natural sciences (mechanics, physics, chemistry and mathematics). The “modern science of technology” is production for production’s sake without “looking first at the ability of the human hand to perform the new processes” (Marx 1977, 616). It is clear, that for Marx human emancipation impinges upon the total transformation of the very nature of labour. The head and the hand belong to the same organism and ending the division of labour between manual and mental labour, the foundation of a new society. When Marx critiques the Platonic Republic in *Capital* and not only calls it an “Athenian idealization of the Egyptian caste system” (Marx 1977, 489) but especially points out that with Plato even when the product of labour is not an exchange value but a useful commodity, it is the worker who must adapt to labour not the work to the labourer (Marx 1977, 487 fn 57). Not only Plato but most writers of antiquity including Homer and Xenophon had an uncritical attitude toward the division of labour while focusing on the quality of products and their use value (Marx 1977, 488).

The absolute contradiction within capitalist production generates a “revolutionary ferment” whose aim is the “abolition of the old division of labor” and the recreation “of society on a new basis” (Marx 1977, 619). The transformation of the relationship between labour and the means of production and its relationship in the metabolism between humans and nature and with the very form of labour during the production process becomes the beginning of a new human development. Therefore, a “higher form of society” is a society in which “the full and free development of every individual forms the ruling principle” (Marx 1977, 739). Nevertheless, the opening of such a whole new perspective does not end our problematic and does not dispel various and even contradictory interpretations of Marx. Perhaps what makes conceptualizing a post-capitalist society difficult is the need to clear from the mind the narrow confines of material production. Transcendence of material necessity and entrance into the sphere of true freedom requires a deeper exploration of Marx’s

continent of thought.

Marx divides social labour under capitalism into “necessary labour” and “surplus labour.” Necessary labour is labour for reproducing the workers’ means of subsistence. Surplus labour is the labour that generates surplus value. Surplus value is both for accumulation of capital as well as for limitless means of subsistence of a class that lives off of other people’s labour. Surplus labour creates “free time” for the unproductive section of society. Under capitalism the reduction of necessary labour to a minimum is not possible. “Only the abolition of the capitalist form of production would permit the reduction of the working day to the necessary labour-time” (Marx 1977, 667). In such a situation, “

the part of social working day necessarily taken up with material production is shorter, and as a consequence, the time at society’s disposal for the free intellectual and social activity of the individual is greater...The absolute minimum limit to the shortening of the working day is, from this point of view, the universality [*Allgemeinheit*] of labour. [Marx 1977, 667]

Marx stresses that “we must distinguish here between universal labor and communal labor” (Marx 1981, 199). Both communal and universal labour play their part in the process of production. Both get combined but at the same time are different from each other. “Universal labor is all scientific work, all discovery and invention ... communal labor, however, simply involves the direct cooperation of individuals” (Marx 1981, 199). As we’ve seen, the social division of labour under capitalism not only separates mental and manual labour but turns them against each other. All science, though the product of general development of human society, nevertheless becomes the means of exploitation of labour and is materialized as the productive power of capital. Capital has no need for knowledge, expertise and the intellect of the worker and directly suppresses it. The restoration of the metabolism between human nature and external nature necessitates the inversion of the existing inverted relationship.

The transcendence of capitalist social relations depends on grasping Marx’s concept of necessity and freedom. Necessity itself, which in part means necessary labour needs to be further explored. All human societies need to interact with nature to satisfy their

needs and produce and reproduce conditions of life. In Marx’s projection of the post-capitalist society not only the horizon and quality of needs expand but the very nature of necessary labour itself will be transformed. Labour for material production is not only undertaken in rational cooperation with others but especially must be undertaken by individuals who are “freely associated” (Marx 1977, 173). Such labour must be carried out “with the least expenditure of energy and in conditions most worthy and appropriate for their human nature” (Marx 1981, 959).

Even though such a sphere is no longer blind necessity it nevertheless remains within the sphere of necessity. “The true realm of freedom, the development of human powers as an end in itself begins beyond it” (Marx 1981, 959). The realm of freedom, therefore, according to its very essence “begins beyond” the realm of necessity, but only unfolds from such a foundation. To reach such a great transformation, what Marx calls the “universal labour of human spirit” (Marx 1981, 199), necessitates a period of transition. The fundamental precondition for such a transition is the “shortening of the working day” (Marx 1981, 959). With the reduction of necessary labour of material production to a minimum there appears free time for development of scientific, artistic, and other forms of labour. This is the free time for the total development of the individual. Free time is both leisure time and time for “higher activities.” Labour in its current form is replaced by the development of “self-activity.” In place of direct natural needs there arises needs that have been produced historically. The pure necessity of an external natural aim is removed from human aims and purposes. Humanity’s activity becomes self-actualization or objectification of inherent subjective capacities, or, real freedom. Then, as Marx would say, a whole new Subject enters history in whose “head resides the accumulated knowledge of society” (Marx 1973, 712).

References

- Marx, Karl. 1973. *Grundrisse*. Vintage.
- Marx, Karl. 1977. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Vol. 1*. Ben Fowkes translation. Vintage.
- Marx, Karl. 1981. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Vol. 3*. Vintage.]
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 1975. *Collected Works*. New York: International Publishers. reference as “Marx and Engels 1975